

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Executive Order B-37-16

Water Shortage Contingency Plan (WSCP) Public Workshop

September 1, 2016 | Orange County, CA

CA Department of Water Resources, State Water Resources Control Board, Department of Food and Agriculture, California Public Utilities Commission, and California Energy Commission

Prepared by the Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP)

Meeting Objectives

- Present and receive comment on a framework and key concepts that would result in Water Shortage Contingency Plans (WSCPs) that water suppliers are able to implement quickly and effectively during statewide droughts as directed in Executive Order B-37-16.

Background

On May 9, 2016, Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr. issued Executive Order B-37-16 (EO). This EO builds on the conservation accomplished during the recent drought and implementation of the Governor's California Water Action Plan and temporary statewide emergency water restrictions to establish longer-term water conservation measures, including permanent monthly water use reporting, new permanent water use standards in California communities, and bans on clearly wasteful practices (e.g., hosing off sidewalks, driveways, and other hardscapes). The full text of the EO can be found online at <http://www.water.ca.gov/wateruseefficiency/conservation/>.

The EO designates several responsibilities to the Department of Water Resources (DWR), California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), and Energy Commission (CEC) (collectively, the EO State agencies) to satisfy the EO Directives. The EO State Agencies have been working in project teams (collectively, the EO Project Teams) to address the various components outlined in the EO Directives.

The EO specifically directs DWR and SWRCB to consult with urban suppliers, local governments, environmental groups, and other partners to update requirements for water shortage planning, directly in relation to EO directives #8, #9 and #10:

EO #8: *The Department shall strengthen requirements for urban Water Shortage Contingency Plans, which urban water agencies are required to maintain. These updated requirements shall include adequate actions to respond to droughts lasting at least five years, as well as more frequent and severe periods of drought. While remaining*

customized according to local conditions, the updated requirements shall also create common statewide standards so that these plans can be quickly utilized during this and any future droughts.

EO #9: *The Department shall consult with urban water suppliers, local governments, environmental groups, and other partners to update requirements for Water Shortage Contingency Plans. The updated draft requirements shall be publicly released by January 10, 2017.*

EO #10: *For areas not covered by a Water Shortage Contingency Plan, the Department shall work with counties to facilitate improved drought planning for small water suppliers and rural communities.*

This meeting was a public workshop to discuss and receive suggestions on a framework for the development of Water Shortage Contingency Plans (WSCPs) by water suppliers. Several members of the Urban Advisory Group (UAG) were in attendance, though the workshop was heavily comprised of public members representing water agencies. DWR staff provided presentations on proposed concepts for WSCP framework design, then looked to participants to provide input and offer suggestions on how this framework might be structured.

Workshop Summary

(Refer to Appendix A for the meeting presentation slides and Appendix B for the Draft Discussion Paper for improving WSCPs)

Unless noted otherwise, responses are from the WSCP Project Team, which includes DWR staff and independent consultants.

A. Recurring Themes

- ❖ Participants generally expressed support for the general framework and understanding for why the state wants a coordinated response to a water shortage emergency; however, they shared several concerns with the possible process and details on how to implement the new requirements.
- ❖ Water reliability assessment information that appears to be lacking in the current WSCPs may be readily available in other documents that water agencies produce.
- ❖ A singular percentage reduction standard applied statewide does not work. It can cause unintended consequences (e.g., less cooperation from customers).
- ❖ Expand the definition of stages beyond reduction measures. Allow for flexibility in what might trigger WSCP stages and how suppliers respond to an emergency (beyond demand reduction). A supplier may switch to groundwater or invoke a water transfer.
- ❖ Clearly differentiate that the long-term conservation and efficiency efforts to achieve the targets established under SB X7-7 are very different from how a supplier might respond to an emergency through its WSCP.
- ❖ The state must describe what may trigger a regional or statewide reduction mandate with the same level of detail that suppliers must provide in their UWMPs and WSCPs. If

water agencies know exactly what might trigger State intervention, agencies can better plan to avoid such an outcome.

- ❖ Stress tests should incorporate climate change factors/recent studies.
- ❖ Triggers need to be clearly defined, and should also be *locally* relevant and developed by local agencies.
- ❖ Concerns were expressed for how the state plans to define “regions.” In some areas of the state, it is reasonable to use county lines, in others it is more appropriate to use hydrogeological boundaries. There is no “one size fits all” for developing regional boundaries.
- ❖ An economist should be included in WSCP planning and analysis to provide information as to “unintended consequences” of WSCP planning (e.g. how an agency’s plans in Central CA might affect the contingency measures of a Southern CA agency)
- ❖ Standardized staged percentages may be acceptable so long as the associated *actions* are local agency specific. Also, not all agencies statewide should be in the same stage. The stage each agency is in should be determined by local conditions.
- ❖ The state should implement a “Stage 0” which would capture voluntary reduction activities, including customer education and outreach, rebate programs, proactive messaging, etc.

B. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Diana Brooks, Chief, Water Use and Efficiency Branch DWR, welcomed attendees in the room and on the webinar, thanking attendees for their participation and valuable input. Kent Frame, DWR, also provided welcoming remarks, with thanks expressed to Metropolitan Water District of Orange County (MWDCO) for hosting the workshop. He noted that a similar workshop was held the previous day in Sacramento, where substantial constructive dialogue was facilitated among participants.

Stephanie Lucero, Center for Collaborative Policy Facilitator, reviewed the agenda, meeting ground rules, and provided webinar instructions. She emphasized emailing written comments to wue@water.ca.gov and reviewed the websites where meeting materials and updates will be posted. She informed participants that the primary purpose of the meeting was to provide an opportunity for the EO State agencies to receive stakeholders’ input on WSCP framework development.

C. Overview of Executive Order B-37-16 Directive Implementation

Mr. Frame briefly described the context for the EO and the EO directives associated with the topic of this workshop, including the context for developing a draft WSCP framework per existing statutory language. He then reviewed the activities taken to date and future planned activities by the EO State Agencies that will serve to meet the directives outlined in the EO.

Mr. Frame next described the focus of the WSCP framework, and emphasized the importance of ensuring the framework includes standards, and assures quick response by agencies in times of emergency. Key feedback on the draft WSCP framework received by UAG members and the public at the 08-31-16 Sacramento workshop was shared, before a framework overview was provided.

He then projected a diagram and described the following four key components (or phases) of a WSCP, and the corresponding roles of the urban supplier and state agencies:

1. Plan
2. Assess
3. Respond
4. Report

D. WSCP Framework: Planning and Assessing Supply and Demand

A review of the proposed responsibilities related to WSCP framework planning was provided. *(Refer to presentation slides 10-14, Appendix A)*

Discussion from Workshop participants was prompted with two questions related to **planning**:

1. *When performing drought risk analysis, should temporary supply augmentation sources be included before or after assessing actual or projected supply?*
2. *Where is WSCP consistency across a region or the state needed?*

And three discussion questions related to assessing supply and **demand**:

1. *Does the basic draft framework adequately improve local drought planning and better accountability and meet the objective of EO#8?*
2. *What may be other key objectives of EO#8?*
3. *How could a water supplier quickly implement and fund a WSCP?*

Discussion

- How does the “stress-test” factor in to the WSCPs? Will this be a tool implemented going forward, or will other components of the Urban Water Management Plans (UWMPs) be replacing the need for stress-tests in the future?
 - Response: This is uncertain, as pending legislation may require new tools to be implemented. However, the hope is that effective WSCP would provide the basis for the State to require stress tests, as currently executed. Additionally, State Agencies are currently exploring having urban suppliers conduct annual internal “drought-risk assessments” of their current year water supplies as part of their 5-year UWMP update cycle. If during this annual assessment a risk to supply is triggered, the agency would then invoke their WSCP and subsequently begin reporting on plan implementation actions to the state.

- Response: As a point of clarification, it is proposed that the State would only receive results of an internal annual assessment *if* a risk is triggered. Otherwise, agencies will only be required to submit their five-year service reviews/UWMP updates.
- If an agency/supplier conducts an annual assessment, as well as looking forward five years per UWMP requirements, and a drought-risk trigger is identified for the five-year projection date (not the current year's assessment), would the agency then be required to implement their WSCP in the *current* year?
 - Response: A concrete answer is not available at this time. Currently, even the triggers have yet to be defined. There may be situations where a WSCP would need to be implemented several years in advance of the impending risk, depending on the severity and particular conditions of the risk.
- Will the "triggers" be established such that they are localized/reflective of local conditions, or will state-wide umbrella triggers be defined? It is strongly recommended that local jurisdictions help to develop triggers, as the conditions of water supply vary dramatically across the state. Secondly, are the triggers meant to activate various stages in the Ordinance?
 - Response: The triggers are primarily based upon an assessment taking place as part of the conditions set forth in the WSCPs, and therefore based upon local assessments that may demonstrate a risk to the water supply and demand ratio. A tripped trigger then invokes the water shortage supply response actions outlined in the WSCP. However, there are instances where triggers could be state-driven. For example, the declaration of a statewide emergency could then result in all agencies invoking their WSCPs; note that the response is still locally-driven and defined.
- [UAG member]: In reference to the WSCP framework diagram slide, the dark green box for "long-term drought risk assessment" is predominantly related to supply and demand on the 5-year planning horizon. It is suggested to relabel this box accordingly.
- It is suggested to somehow include credits, or otherwise account for, use of recycled water in the annual assessments or "stress tests."
 - Response: The stress test is focused on potable water. Thus, potable recycled water is accounted for here. SWRCB is currently working with DWR to develop what may become a short-term drought-related stress test. Whether or not this short-term test will include recycled water will depend on how that water is ultimately used.
- Will rebate programs be accounted for in stress test assessments?
 - Response: That is unknown at this time.
- [UAG member]: Do either the long-term or annual drought-risk assessments take into consideration a) past performance, b) past yields, and/or c) climate change factors? It is critical to acknowledge that moving forward, due to climate change, California's "dry" years will become drier, and past performance will no longer be predictive of future conditions. DWR and SWRCB may consider taking a conservative approach with the assessments.

- Response: It is currently unknown as to whether these considerations will be required factors of drought-risk assessments. However, there are water agencies who have already developed WSCPs that do include these factors, and they may be looked to as examples.
 - Response: The California Water Commission is requiring the use of climate data as a risk factor in water supply calculations. It is reasonable that SWRCB may follow the same or similar approach.
- [UAG member]: Climate Resolve plans to submit into the record recent studies on climate change conducted by Stanford University. These studies indicated greater evapotranspiration (ET) rates and higher rates of snow melt statewide.
 - Response: DWR is also reviewing Paleo studies and various climate prediction models to determine if/how these will be incorporated in to risk-assessment design.
 - [Facilitator]: Each agency has their own preferred method for assessing climate. Please submit any detailed examples of how this is done into the written record for DWR's consideration.
 - Response: The key take-away from DWR's perspective is the need for better, and more consistent planning. Many water agencies do not have comprehensive WSCPs for any number of reasons (e.g. lack of staff or funding), and DWR is seeking to help these agencies develop their WSCPs.
- Regarding triggers, it is important to consider how one agency' planning, or lack of planning, could affect another. For example, the way in which northern California agencies manage their snowmelt could have an implication on the available water for "downstream" central or southern California agencies. It is requested that this state-wide planning effort include an economist to conduct an "unintended consequences" analysis. It is possible for one agency to unintentionally include stranded assets in their WSCPs in order to meet statewide requirements.
- Regarding ideas on how to quickly fund implementation of a WSCP, there are a variety of resources available to agencies. However, what is critical is to promote is financial *resiliency*. It is suggested the state provide an overall, broad financial goal that allows for local flexibility in funding mechanisms such that agencies can maintain financial resiliency in support of their WSCP. The state should not require specific details of a financial plan, as these may change in short notice.
- One recurring complication with a statewide approach to WSCP requirements is that what works well for some agencies does not work well for others. Agencies need to demonstrate they have conducted good planning and have the water supply to withstand a five-year or longer drought. The stress test is a good marker for this
- Agreement was expressed regarding the need for an "unintended consequences" analysis. Also, concerns about established statewide triggers not being aligned with local triggers were shared.
- Question of clarification: Is the trigger regarding an analysis of the supply and demand projections meant to be in advance of the five-year projections?

- Response: Currently, DWR is using the term “trigger” as a way of invoking a response to a risk identified via an annual assessment.
- The established triggers should not force an agency who has ample and/or well-managed water supplies to implement strict conservation measures based on overall State conditions.
 - Response: While triggers may be predominantly locally defined, there could be instances where a statewide trigger would activate a mandatory statewide response. An example of this is a Governor-issued Executive Order. However, DWR recognizes the need to build local flexibility on WSCP implementation actions.
 - Response: Note also, there will potentially be two “sets” of triggers – one set that is locally defined, and another set of state-defined regional triggers. DWR is interested in maintaining transparency and predictability in potential state-defined triggers.
- If there is a statewide emergency declared, DWR/SWRCB should immediately poll local agencies to determine what their individual water supply situation is at that moment in time. If a local agency does not have an immediate supply threat for the given projected period of time, they should not have to locally implement mandatory efficiency measures.
 - Response: DWR acknowledges that statewide emergency response should include review of local WSCP implementation measures, and perceives the suggestion that an outlet be provided for those local agencies with sufficient water supply.
 - Response: Please also keep in mind these WSCP triggers and targets are different than the Water Use Efficiency (WUE) targets being developed.
- DWR/SWRCB should be mindful of the impacts that drought/water shortages have on our wastewater systems. It is suggested to review the wastewater system feedback loop, and capacity and infrastructure status of wastewater systems to determine how wastewater systems can be incorporated into advanced water supply and WSCP planning. As water supply and demand becomes more severe, there will be impacts on the ability to recycle water. In this regard, agencies should be careful that in the long term they are not managing water supply to public health standards.
- Metropolitan Water District is in support of the overall EO and WSCP concepts. However, it would be helpful to determine specific actions the state would like to see implemented on a local level both in terms of short-term (annual) and long-term (five-year) planning. Also, caution is advised when grouping or establishing triggers at regional and state levels. Many agencies can be sorted together for convenience rather than functionality.
- [UAG Member]: It is encouraging to hear how individual water agencies prefer localized approaches to conservation measures, and they should be recognized for the important work they have already done to implement water savings. The same should hold true at the user level. For example, a homeowner who has installed a native garden and has no irrigation system to conserve even times of non-drought likely cannot be asked to meet

stricter landscaping water targets in years later. The state should take end-users into account for WSCP development.

- Water supply augmentation is so important that it should be a part of the agencies' annual assessment. It is impossible to always "conserve our way out of drought." Sometimes bringing in water from another source is necessary.
- What is the difference between a regional drought concern trigger versus a trigger SWRCB would develop?
 - Response: Triggers are not yet developed, though SWRCB/DWR are considering developing regional triggers defined by either hydrogeological, county, or groundwater basin boundaries. The intent has always been to provide flexibility in developing the triggers. Some areas of the state are impacted by drought much more than others.
 - Comment: Then, if the Governor declares a state of emergency, it is recommended that all suppliers review their Contingency Plans to determine if a specific action is needed.
- The state is encouraged to develop a clear definition for "trigger," and consider that declaring an emergency should mean a legitimate *emergency*. As in, an area is about to exhaust all of its available water. For example, a new biological opinion should not trigger an emergency response and overturn the great planning the agencies have been conducting. All environmental, economic, social and quality of life impacts should be considered before declaration of an emergency. Long-term unintended consequences should again be considered here.
 - Response [Facilitator]: It is noted that stakeholders have concerns with how triggers are defined and determined, as this has been a major topic of discussion at both these workshops. Stakeholders are encouraged to meet with DWR's request for explicit recommendations from stakeholders on how to define/determine triggers. E.g. a clear description of a regional boundary.
- It is most beneficial to apply monitoring efforts to actual WSCP implementation actions at the individual/local agency level. However, there is value in developing regional drought triggers as they apply to fire protection measures. Fire protection and water supply conditions are often considered separately by agencies.
 - Response: Stakeholders are reminded of EO #10. DWR is required to work with counties to develop WSCPs, and will include all constituents within said county.
- Within a designated region, local water supplies will invariably be different. It is recommended that triggers are locally, rather than regionally, determined.
- What will agencies be required to do when a particular trigger is activated? Will specific actions be defined? There are concerns that when a local supply response is required it will cause undo difficulties to community members and rate payers *if* the actionable responses are arbitrary and not applicable to the local area.
- WSCP should delineate responses to water shortages that are experienced on a local level. This is reflected in the EO to some extent, and a staged response mechanism is a proactive concept.

- Response: The state agencies do acknowledge stakeholders' comments of "keep it local." Please provide suggestions on what those local triggers may consider/include, and if there are ways in which to keep the WSCP more predictable or transparent.
- Response [UAG Member]: There are 412 water agencies in the state. Some have conducted climate modelling and have already developed robust WSCPs. Many others have not. Any examples of robust WSCPs plans or portions of plans that have been successful would be extremely useful in helping the State to develop templates for other agencies. These WSCPs should include triggers, level of response, appropriate response actions, etc.
- Trigger responses should come from a locally analyzed need. DWR/SWRCB should not be asked simply to trust the suppliers. Proactive plans are a necessity.
- [DWR Comment]: The state looks at local impacts of droughts, from communities to individuals, and must also respond to regional and state-wide conditions. Occasionally the state does have to step in assist communities in situations of dire need (e.g. supply Porterville with trucked in water when they exhausted supplies earlier this year). EO #10 is an attempt to address these types of extreme scenarios. The state is currently looking at options for leveraging existing hazard mitigation plans for fire and drought panning emergencies. They are also trying to craft the WSCP requirements in a manner that allows as much local flexibility as possible while still taking into consideration the larger state-wide perspective.
- The state may consider using annual water supply reporting that agencies can now submit via online forms to determine if a trigger is activated.
- [UAG Member]: There may be limitations to having only quantitative triggers. The relationship between water supply and use/need is quite complex. Perhaps incorporating average monthly demands from the last several years into annual assessment calculations could be explored.
- [UAG Member]: The state to look at lessons learned from the most recent drought. There was significant pushback on mandatory conservation measures regarding equity and fairness of the requirements among individual agencies. There were financial and revenue issues that needed to be addressed at the local level. Most water agencies were unable to, or disinclined, to change rate structures for financing measures. Perhaps the state can include a revenue mechanism for emergency conditions. There were also countless reports of dying trees due to irrigation being turned off. There is a lot of opportunity for improving public education methods re: drought measures. It would be beneficial to include an education and communications component in the WSCPs (e.g. ways to keep trees alive during drought conditions). The state also needs to take into consideration the impacts of climate change on water supplies, and perhaps look at a 10-year long-term drought-risk assessment, rather than five years. Lastly, in a drought emergency, there will be compounded water shortages as the same water sources will be tapped for drinking/potable water and fighting fires. This is a critical element to factor into any WSCP.

- The UWMPs do a good job of requiring agencies to plan for longer time frames, including implementing capital projects. It is suggested that the state consider decoupling methods for short-term and long-term drought planning, building from what the UWMPs already require.
- It may be difficult for the state to define certain “regions” based on county lines. For example, San Bernardino County has several hydrogeological boundary conditions in their county lines. One idea to consider is organization of region by Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) area, or by water wholesaler jurisdiction. Also, San Bernardino has implemented a small water systems assistance program where larger agencies have helped ~35 smaller agencies develop WSCPs. DWR may look to this as an example to reference.
- In addition to having an economist involved in this procedure, stakeholders from the operational departments of water districts should participate in the discussions. Many systems were designed for moving large quantities of water, when larger quantities of water were available and populations were less. It will take a significant investment of time and finances to update infrastructure and codes in order to maintain public safety and health. For example, in some areas agencies are not allowed to install purple pipe because of antiquated contracts. There are also other unintended consequences of water reduction measures to consider. E.g. an agency was able to meet its state mandated water conservation target during the last EO, but failed its U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service mandate of preserving gnatcatcher habitat because they could not irrigate the habitat sufficiently.
- There should be caution taken to ensure there is no misinterpretation of supply consistency demands. WSCPs should cover the range of water supply shortages that are possible (i.e. 10%, 50%, etc.). Local agencies should determine their appropriate staged response actions in a detailed, transparent plan for the state to review.
- Existing demand management measures (DMM) can be viewed as a toolbox where local agencies can look for possible actionable responses for phased reductions. However, it is important to leave room for flexibility and innovation in the WSCPs.
- A critical review of both short-term and long-term supply and demand will be important moving forward. If an agency is looking five years ahead and sees a possible supply and demand issue, they can write in preventative actions into WSCPs for the current and upcoming years.
- California will be successful with its proactive drought planning measures if WSCPs are not invoked, even in dry years. Agencies should grow to feel confident they can manage to the supply and demand needed. However, it is difficult to plan for situations where the state might step in and say “X region is out of water, so Y region needs to augment their supplies.”
- Options for water supply augmentation should be incorporated in the WSCPs. For example, one agency might have an agreement for an exchange with another. Agencies may also want to identify drought resilient water supplies in their WSCPs. Including a communications/education component in the WSCP as previously suggested is a good idea. Looking five years into the future for long-term planning is likely adequate; there

are many uncertainties ten years into the future. Lastly, considering San Diego County as a region is practical. There are rural areas in this county that may need state assistance in the near future.

- Response [UAG Member]: If an agency is conducting augmentation and plans to purchase extra water during a shortage, the details of the MOU showing such purchasing authority should be included in the WSCP. It is inclusion of the details of the planned implementation actions that are essential.

E. WSCP Framework: Responding and Reporting

A review of the proposed responsibilities related to WSCP responding was provided. **(Refer to presentation slides 15-19, Appendix A)**

Discussion from workshop participants was then prompted with the following discussion questions related to **responding and reporting**:

1. *Are the local and State responses adequate?*
2. *Is the proposed level of reporting to the state sufficient?*
3. *What would make reporting easier to submit and analyze?*
4. *How do we define baselines to evaluate conservation savings?*
5. *What elements are incorporated into a trigger?*
6. *At what point does a trigger elicit a WSCP Stage?*
7. *How are the local agencies defining shortage?*

Discussion

- Coachella Valley reports to the state monthly, annually, a five-year projection and a 20-year projection. If one of these assessments indicates a shortage, is a trigger then activated?
 - Response: The annual assessment would indicate if a trigger is activated. Agencies will not be required to report to the State their assessment findings if no triggers are activated. The assessment will look at usage reports, estimates, supply and demand, and how these factors will ultimately effect service to the customer case.
 - Response: As an example, Agency X will conduct an annual analysis. If there are no triggers activated, then when their UWMPs are submitted they will simply include those last five years of records.
- When the Governor announces there is a statewide water shortage, is the intent to review annual assessment reports and use these as the mechanism for mandatory implementation of WSCPs?
 - Response: The state agencies are looking to stakeholders for their perspectives on how this should be managed. If the state identifies a concern, a first step would be to review what all agencies are doing locally before making global decisions.

- The question about what defines a shortage is very complex. Current supply and demand studies may use review of historic periods to assist with planning and implementation of strategies. But current and extended drought conditions result in a deterioration of such models. Maintenance of necessary agriculture and indoor water supply should be of highest conservation priority. The stress tests being used at the state level are not always useful at the local level.
- There are advantages to automating monthly reports via online reporting forms worth emphasizing. The state should also allow the option of agencies setting mandatory targets that would match local conditions.
- Los Angeles Department of Water and Power defines “shortage” as a 5% deficit in supply.
- MWDSC defines “shortage” as a deficit that requires the water supplier to identify available reductions in water demand. This is not always due to actual water availability. It could be a result of system malfunction, poor system management, or natural disaster such as an earthquake or excessive demands due to wildfire.
 - [Facilitator]: It is beneficial for the state agencies to identify factors that could cause a water shortage, specific to various agencies and/or regions.
 - Response: Perhaps the term “shortage” should be narrowed. E.g. a reduction of water supply constitutes a staged reduction.
- Do water suppliers use models similar to those of financial planners?
 - [Facilitator]: A straw poll of the 50+ participants indicated the vast majority of present water suppliers do use such a modeling method.
 - Response: Those folks in the room using sophisticated models are not where the concerns are driven. The state is attempting to establish consistency and collective good planning among all 412 water agencies, including those who do not use models or plan. Hence the request for examples.
- Perhaps it is possible to take existing solutions/WSCPs and apply them to communities that are in need.
 - Response [UAG member]: Yes, that is what the state agencies are attempting to articulate. They would like to see good examples from the stakeholders as the standards other water agencies without plans may use.
- Agencies must review water supply via a host of bigger-picture demand factors. The hope is that any mandates will provide the local agencies flexibility to review their whole system.
- Microeconomics of supply and demand assessments must also be considered. For example, how does marketing and outreach effect water use across various demographics? The state should begin studying the microeconomic impacts related to various DMMs. Such data would support water shortage resiliency efforts.
- Note that several agencies are interested in helping DWR develop the WSCP framework, though they do not want to be penalized for other agencies not completing their responsibilities.
- Short-term and long-term shortages may need to be defined. This effort can be viewed as separate from long-term WUE processes.

- Office of Emergency Services (OES) staff should be involved in emergency drought planning as well as WSCP planning.
 - Response: OES has been involved in drought planning to an extent, and they will be involved with EO #10. It was suggested at the 08/31 workshop to use hazard mitigation response structure for drought response planning. This is a new concept for the state, as the drought is not yet directly coupled with hazard mitigation.
 - Comment: None of the state's other emergency response plans can work without water.
- If an agency is self-certified and their supply-demand target is 0, where supply meets demand and demand is 0, then that can be interpreted as there is no shortage.
- Casitas Municipal Water District is self-certified with a target of 0. However, they asked for a 30% reduction from their customers, continuing the message of "the drought is still on." They do not wish to be penalized if they end at a 29% reduction while doing everything they can to meet long term planning targets.
- Percent reductions should be tied to demand reductions, not only supply reductions.
- Water conservation and self-certification should be considered minimal level of drought response planning.
- [State Agency]: Is it considered good planning to plan for water supply contingency based on meeting a zero supply reduction level, or is it better to begin planning before you meet that level to prevent the possibility of entering into a higher reduction scenario?
 - This is good planning to start conserving before meeting the zero mark. It is preferable to have supply exceeding demand in case of risk. Furthermore, there is a stage before the indicated "stage 1 reduction" that is voluntary conservation messaging to customers. I.e. a risk to water supply is occurring, so please volunteer to save water not before mandatory conservation actions are enacted.
 - Other stakeholders indicated agreement with the importance of supply being greater than demand. Others were agreeable to voluntary measures as a first step in conservation.
- It is suggested that the Stage 2 reduction actions are focused on the 15% of heavy water users in the particular local. They could be identified via the water agencies usage reports by parcel. This would go a long way for residents seeing some degree of equity towards drought response.
- Having statewide standardized drought response stages is acceptable, so long as the local agencies can determine when to put them into effect. The reasons for water shortages are not as important to the customers as the shortages themselves. The stages should focus on WSCP rather than long-term planning.
- The state's role in determining the stages should be minimal, as planning is very agency-specific. Also, LADWP is always in a Stage 1 mandatory water conservation stage. They have an external contingency plan can address small water shortages beyond State 1 conservation measures.

- A “stage 0” volunteer conservation state is a smart idea, and would also allow for the opportunity to offer improved water efficiently rebates without scaring customers with “drought warning” messaging.
- [State Agency]: To reiterate, stakeholders are stating that the reduction stages and percentage reductions should be locally determined by the agencies. The reason DWR is considering standardizing the stages is to provide for local flexibility and response, however this may not be the approach in which to accomplish such flexibility.
 - Comment: Standardized percentages may be acceptable so long as the associates *actions* are local agency specific. Also, not all agencies statewide should be in the same stage. The stage each agency is in should be determined by local conditions.
 - [Facilitator]: Via a straw poll, the majority of participants concurred with this response.
 - [Response]: This local tightening of targets will be of help to agencies who have conducted massive drought response measures already any may not have the ability to save another 10%.
 - [Response]: Note that a Senate Bill was recently passed on 08/29 that refers to mandatory water reduction measures.

F. Closing Comments

Ms. Lucero reiterated that future comments can be sent to the water use efficiency e-mail address - WUE@water.ca.gov. The link to the summary reports from this series of discussions will be posted on the website xxx

G. Attendees

Full Name	Affiliation
Nate Adams	SMWD
Tom Ash	IEUA
Drew Atwater	MNWD
Joe Berg*	MWDOC
Rosemarie Chora	City of Oceanside
Shannon Cotella	STPUD
Michelle Curtis	Helix Water District
Autumn Dewoody	Webb Associates
Robert Doxsee	City of Burbank Water & Power
Peter Dugan	LADWP
Katie Evans	Coachella Valley Water District
Daisy Farias	WVWD
Andriana Figueroa	Norwalk

Justin Finch	Mesa Water District
Dana Frieauf	SDCWA
Karly Gaynor	Western MWD
Teresa Gomez	City of Oceanside
Brandon Goshi	MWDSC
Ken Jenkins	California Water Service
Chris Lingard	-
Elizabeth Lovsted	EMWD
Marc Marcantonio	Yorba Linda Water District
Sofia Marcus	LADWP
Lucia McGovern	City of Camarillo
Bob McVicken	GSWC
Ron Merkling	Casitas MWD
Ashley Metzger	Desert Water Agency
Damon Micalizzi	YLWD
Scott Miller	City of Westminster
Jennifer Nevills	MWD
Phuong Nguyen	City of Fullerton
Mike Obermiller	City of Poway
Lisa Ohlund	EOCWD
Wayne Osborne	MWDOC
Jonathan Parfrey*	Climate Resolve
Jessica Parks	SFID
Ruby Picone	Norwalk
Cathy Pieroni	City of San Diego
Ian Richard	Camrosa Water District
Tracy Quinn*	Natural Resources Defense Council
Nicholas Schreider	MWA
Al Shaikh	City of Anaheim
Sarina Sriboonlue	Arcadis
Jat Tamaribuchi	MWDOC
Lo Tau	OCWD
Kimberly Thorner	Olivenhain MWD
Katie Victria	Garden Grove
Kellie Welch	Irvine Ranch WD
Ron Wolfarth	Rainbird Corporation

*UAG Member

Agency and Consultants

Full Name	Agency/ Organization
Diana Brooks	Department of Water Resources
Kent Frame	Department of Water Resources
Greg Young	Tully & Young
Stephanie Lucero (Facilitator)	Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS
Meagan Wylie	Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS

The following Agencies/Organizations attended via Webinar:

Association of CA Water Agencies	El Toro Water District
AVEK Water Agency	EVMWD
Carlsbad Municipal Water District	Laguna Beach County Water District
Carlsbad Municipal Water District	Monte Vista Water District
City of Clovis	MWH
City of Fresno	OMWD
City of Fresno Water Division	RMC
City of Lodi	San Diego County Water Authority
City of Poway	SDCWA
City of San Diego	SL-serco
City of Santa Barbara	Ventura Regional Sanitation District
City of Santa Maria	Water Systems Consulting, Inc.
CPUC	Yucaipa Valley Water District
Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District	